REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are presently pending in the instant application. Claims 1-16 have been rejected under 35 USC §101. Claims 1, 8, 17, and 24 have been rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph. Claims 1-12 and 17-24 have been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,78,045 to Bettles in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,081,814 to Ramasubramani et al (Ramasubramani). Finally, claims 13-16 have been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bettles in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,896,440 to Reed et al (Reed) as applied to claims 9 and 10 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,774,552 to Grimmer. Claims 1, 8, 9, 17, and 24 have been amended. Applicant's submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance for the reasons provided herein. Support for the amendments can be found in the entire specification. No new matter has been added by the amendment.

Claim rejections under 35 USC §101

Claims 1-16 have been rejected under 35 USC §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that claims 1-8 recite limitations that teach only to the manipulation of abstract data on the system and that claims 9-16 recite limitations that teach only to the means and processes by which abstract data could be manipulated.

"To be statutory, a claimed computer-related process must either: (A) result in a physical transformation outside the computer for which a practical application in the technological arts is either disclosed in the specification or would have been known to a skilled artisan, or (B) be limited to a practical application within the technological arts." See MPEP 2106 IV. B. 2. (b).

PO9-99-151/IB2-0005   8

The Applicant has amended claims 1 and 9 in a non-narrowing manner. Specifically, amended claim 1 recites "receiving a digital certificate for a user requesting access to said computer network...comparing a distinguished name or a partial distinguished name corresponding to the digital certificate with a plurality of mapping records." Applicant's amended claim 9 recites "a digital certificate means for receiving a distinguished name over said computer network, said distinguished name corresponding to the user...a distinguished name mapping record within a directory database, said distinguished name mapping record indicative of at least a portion of said distinguished name...". With respect to amended Claim 1, the Applicant has included an interaction with the network user at the time the method is being effected.   Therefore, the method of Claim 1 has a practical application in the technological arts. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the method of Claim 1 is statutory subject matter. Claims 2-8 depend from Claim 1, and thus are believed to be statutory subject matter due to their dependency on Claim 1.

With respect to claim 9, the Applicant has included wording directed to a computer network system. Therefore, the method of Claim 9 has a practical application in the technological arts. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the method of Claim 9 is a statutory subject matter. Claims 10-16 depend from Claim 9, and thus are believed to be statutory subject matter due to their dependency on Claim 1.

The Applicant submits that the amendments to claims 1 and 9 are not intended to narrow the scope of claims 1 and 9. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections is requested.

Claim rejections under 35 USC §112, second paragraph

Claims 1, 8, 17, and 24 have been rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner has objected to the phrase "thereby allowing" used in Claims 1 and 17. Further the Examiner has objected to the term "the system status" as recited in claims 8 and 24.   The Applicant

has amended claims 1 and 17 to recite "wherein the environmental factor includes one or more system or application statuses in effect at the time the user signs-on the computer network operable for enabling the first matching mapping record to point to multiple user identifications..."

The Applicant has further adopted the Examiner's suggestion and amended claims 8 and 24 to recite "wherein the environmental factor includes a system status existing at the time the user signs-on the computer network, and replacing a variable includes replacing the variable from the matching mapping record with said system status."

Claims 1, 8, 17, and 24 are sufficiently definite in that they particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the outstanding rejections.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-12 and 17-24.

Claims 1-12 and 17-24 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bettels in view of Ramasubramani for the reasons set forth in pages 4-6 of the Office Action. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 1-12 and 17-24 for at least the following reasons.

For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art; that the prior art

PO9-99-151/IB2-0005   10

relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references; and that the proposed modification of the prior art must have had a reasonable expectation of success, determined from the vantage point of the skilled artisan at the time the invention was made. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970).

Applicant's amended claims 1 and 17 recite, respectively, a method and storage medium for authorizing a user on a computer network using chained mapping records comprising:

"receiving a digital certificate for a user requesting access to said computer network;

comparing a distinguished name or a partial distinguished name corresponding to the digital certificate with a plurality of mapping records;

replacing a variable from a first matching mapping record with an environmental factor to create a first search criteria, the first matching mapping record indicating the distinguished name or the partial distinguished name, wherein the environmental factor includes one or more system or application statuses in effect at the time the user signs-on the computer network operable for enabling the first matching mapping record to point to multiple user identifications;

comparing the first search criteria with the plurality of mapping records; and

generating an authorization indicator responsive to at least one of comparing the distinguished name or a partial distinguished name and comparing the first search criteria with the plurality of mapping records."

Neither Bettels nor Ramasubramani teaches or recites "authorizing a user on a computer network using chained mapping records...including: receiving a digital certificate for a user requesting access to said computer network; ...generating an authorization indicator responsive to at least one of comparing the distinguished name or a

PO9-99-151/1132-0005   11

partial distinguished name and comparing the first search criteria with the plurality of mapping records." Additionally, neither Bettels nor Ramasubramani teaches or recites "wherein the environmental factor includes one or more system or application statuses in effect at the time the user signs-on the computer network operable for enabling the first matching mapping record to point to multiple user identifications" as recited in Claims 1 and 17.

Rather, Bettels discloses an email addressing system (col. 1, lines 17-21) for international communications to accommodate a variety of different languages (col. 1, lines 52-64). Further, the Bettles reference teaches a method for creating synonym names for entries in a directory information tree to solve the problem of making international use of a system such as X.500 for correctly addressing information (e.g. for email). The directory tree described by Bettels includes synonym names to translate between different alphabets and scripts associated with different languages (e.g., Latin, Japanese). Bettels also teaches that a system such as X.500 is designed to store and maintain information about objects, which may contain information about organizations and individuals. Bettels teaches receiving a request such as a search or look-up using an alias object (i.e., using the name as expressed in an alternative script) and reformulating the request into a request using the original entry object (i.e., using the name as expressed in the original script).

Ramasubramani discloses a central certificate management system for minimizing the latency of obtaining a certificate with a mobile device, or thin client, due to their limited processing capabilities and memory restrictions. The system maintains a certificate database, ...to reserve a list of undesignated but issued certificates, referred to as free certificates, from one or different CAs. Whenever a user account is created to activate a mobile device that requires one or more certificates to access certain web servers requiring a certificate, a certificate request...signal is sent to the CMM 342 to fetch needed certificates from the certificate database" (Abstract; col. 7, lines 36-45). "Upon receiving the fetched certificates from the certificate database, the CMM 342 assigns the certificates to the particular account by attaching the device ID 316 and other account information..."

(col. 7, lines 46-49). The certificate database is then replenished with additional free certificates if the number of available certificates reaches a specified threshold (col. 7, lines 51-60). Ramasubramani further recites a distinguished name prefix generator 406 that generates a prefix for a distinguished name which comprises " a concatenation of a timestamp and a subscriber ID" for ensuring the uniqueness of each distinguished name (col. 10, lines 47-59). The distinguished name prefix of the Ramasubramani reference is not synonymous with the environmental factor used as a replacement for a variable in a mapping record. The variable name is replaced with an environmental factor associated with the variable name existing at the time the digital certificate was received and is used to create a new search criteria for a user account when the current search was unsuccessful. The environmental factors used in the instant application enable vectoring of the mapping records, not for ensuring the uniqueness of a distinguished name as provided in the Ramasubramani reference.

Therefore, neither Bettels nor Ramasubramani, alone or in combination, teaches or recites "authorizing a user on a computer network using chained mapping records...including: receiving a digital certificate for a user requesting access to said computer network; ..."generating an authorization indicator responsive to at least one of comparing the distinguished name or a partial distinguished name and comparing the first search criteria with the plurality of mapping records." Nor does Bettels and Ramasubramani teach or recite "wherein the environmental factor includes one or more system or application statuses in effect at the time the user signs-on the computer network operable for enabling the first matching mapping record to point to multiple user identifications" as provided in Applicant's claims 1 and 17. Even, assuming for the sake of argument, that the elements of Applicant's claims 1 and 17 were present in the references, combining the Bettels reference and the Ramasubramani reference would not produce the "enabling the first matching mapping record to point to multiple user identifications." The Applicant submits that Claims 1 and 17 are in condition for allowance. Claims 2-8 depend from what is an allowable claim 1. Claims 18-24 depend from what is now an allowable claim 17. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 2-8 and 18-24 are in

PO9-99-151/TB2-0005   13

condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the outstanding rejections.

Applicant further submits that claim 9 is in condition for allowance for at least the reasons provided above with respect to claims 1 and 17. Claims 10-12 depend from what is an allowable claim 9. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections of claims 9-12.

Claims 13-16.

Claims 13-16 have also been rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bettels in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,896,440 to Reed et al (Reed) as applied to claims 9 and 10 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,774,552 to Grimmer for the reasons specified in page 6 of the Office Action. The Applicant respectfully traverses the outstanding rejections for the following reasons.

Regarding Claim 9, and as described previously in reference to Claim 1, Bettels does not teach or suggest the feature: "wherein the first environmental factor includes one or more system or application statuses in effect at the time said digital certificate is received operable for enabling said first matching mapping record to point to multiple user identities," as recited in Claim 9.

Applicant's claims 13-16 are dependent upon an allowable claim 9. For at least this reason, claims 13-16 are in condition for allowance. Notwithstanding, the Applicant further submits that the Examiner has misapplied the Reed reference. Reed discloses a system for allowing diverse telecommunication networks to communicate with each other over a unified communication link. Reed teaches allowing the automatic gathering of administrative data (such as trouble reports) from diverse locations. Thus, Reed does not cure the deficiency in Bettels as described above with respect to Claim 9. Accordingly, Claims 13-16 are patentable over Bettels in view of Reed.

Grimmer discloses a method and apparatus for retrieving X.500 certificates from an X.500 directory service agent, but does not teach allowing a "matching mapping record to point to multiple user identities" as recited in Claim 9. Thus, Grimmer does not cure the deficiency of Bettels. Accordingly, the combination of Bettels and Grimmer does not render claims 13-16 obvious. Accordingly, claims 13-16 are believed to be allowable for at least these reasons.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicant's attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 09-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP
Applicant's Attorneys

By: _Marisa J. Dubuc_

Marisa J. Dubuc
Reg. No. 46,673
Cantor Colburn LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
(860) 286-2929
(860) 286-0115 FAX
Customer Service No. 23413

Date: April 6, 2004

PO9-99-151/032-0005   15